(a) whether it is a fact that various committees have been set up consisting of High Court Judges to inquire into the conduct of other Judges of collateral jurisdiction; and

(b) whether any action is contemplated against Judges whose kiths and kins are practicing in the same High Court?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) and (b) Government have consulted the Supreme Court of India.The Supreme Court has informed as below:

"It is a fact that three fact finding Committees each consisting of two sitting Chief Justices and a Judge of different High Courts have been constituted by the then Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India to enquire into the alleged allegations against the Judges of the Karnataka High Court and Punjab and Haryana High Court and the High Court of Rajasthan.

No action against any Judge of the High Courts whose kith and kin are practising in the same High Court is contemplated at present."

Check on errant Judges

583. SHRI DATTA MEGHE: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Attorney-General of India has emphasised the need to set up a body to check errant Judges in the country;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether several Judges are deliberately delaying in judgements for years together and postponing such cases;

(d) if so, the details thereof and whether any time-frame would be fixed for Judges to deliver the judgements; and

(e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) and (b) Yes Sir.The Attorney-General of India referred to Paragraph 7.3.8 of the Report of the National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution which deals with the removal of Judges and remedies for deviant behaviour.

(c) to (e) In order to reduce the anxiety of the litigants and the need for early delivery of judgements after the hearing is over the Arrears Committee has suggested as below:

"Reserved judgements should ordinarily be pronounced within six weeks of the conclusion of the arguments. In the event of judgements not being pronounced within three months of the conclusion of the arguments, the Chief Justice may either post the case for delivering judgement in open court or withdraw the case and post it for disposal before an appropriate Bench. Appropriate rule or statutory provision should be made for this purpose."

The Chief Justice of the High Courts have been advised to make appropriate rule or provision and direct the concerned authorities for early delivery of the judgements after the hearing is over.

Civil Procedure Code has been amended in 2002 to provide a time-limit for delivery of judgements.

Fast Courts going slow

584. SHRI R.R GOENKA: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the setting up of the Fast Track Courts for dispensing quicker justice has not yet gained momentum in different States as brought out in a news-item captioned, "Fast Courts going slow", which appeared in theTimes of India, dated 11th January, 2003; and

(b) if so, the details of steps being taken to speed up the process and also to reorient the functioning of these courts for quicker disposal of cases in the light of the experience gained, so far?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) No, Sir. As per available information, 1307 Fast Track Courts have been notified by various States in the country, out of which 990 Fast Track Courts have already started functioning. These courts have so far disposed of 77,023 cases.

(b) It is the paimary responsibility of the State Governments and the High Courts to administer these courts as envisaged under the Fast Track Court Scheme. The Supreme Court in its Judgement dated the